



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,843	05/04/2001	Anna Vadimovna Noyes	8120	2266

27752 7590 07/16/2003

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

BOYER, CHARLES I

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1751

10

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/849,843	Applicant(s) Noyes et al
	Examiner Charles Boyer	Art Unit 1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 21, 2003
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some* c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 7 and 9
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other:

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to applicants' amendment and response received April 21, 2003.

Claims 1-34 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in-
(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 1-6, 9, 11-24 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Perry et al, US 6,368,359.

Perry et al teach a process for stabilizing dry cleaning solutions (see abstract). An example of such a process contacts an article with decamethylcyclopentasiloxane solvent, removes the solvent, contacts the solvent with salt solutions, then separates and dries the silicone solvent, and finally reuses the solvent (col. 4, example 1 and col. 10, claims 12-16). As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory. With respect to claim

Art Unit: 1751

limitations such as fluid remaining on the fabrics and speed of the spin cycle, the examiner maintains these properties inherently result from a standard laundry machine wash cycle.

Applicants have traversed this rejection on the grounds that Perry et al teach a process for stabilizing dry cleaning solutions, not a cleaning process per se. The examiner maintains that as claim 12 of Perry et al teaches a dry cleaning process which includes contacting an article with a silicone solvent, the cleaning limitation is met. Applicants further argue that Perry et al does not teach a non-immersive cleaning process which limits the amount of solvent contacting the fabric. The examiner maintains that a non-immersive process is not claimed, and as the fabric may be treated with solvent up to the absorption capacity of the fabric, such a completely saturated fabric would be indistinguishable from a fabric immersed in solvent. Accordingly, an immersed fabric meets a saturated fabric limitation and so the rejection is maintained.

3. Claims 1-6, 9, 11-24 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Berndt et al, US 6,063,135.

Berndt et al teach a method for dry cleaning articles (see abstract). An example of such a process contacts an article with a composition comprising decamethylcyclopentasiloxane solvent, detergents, and stabilizers. During the cleaning process, the composition is continuously recycled by removing the solvent and passing it through a filter containing carbon or diatomaceous earth. After cleaning, the solvent is removed by centrifugation and heating, any resulting vapor is condensed for reuse. The used solvent is purified by vacuum distillation and the resulting purified

Art Unit: 1751

solvent is ready for reuse (col. 8, steps 1-7). As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

Applicants have traversed this rejection on the grounds that Berndt et al teach an immersice cleaning method, and not a non-immersice cleaning process which limits the amount of solvent contacting the fabric. The examiner maintains that a non-immersice process is not claimed, and as the fabric may be treated with solvent up to the absorption capacity of the fabric, such a completely saturated fabric would be indistinguishable from a fabric immersed in solvent. Accordingly, an immersed fabric meets a saturated fabric limitation and so the rejection is maintained.

4. Claims 1-9, 11-24 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kilgour et al, US 6,310,029.

Kilgour et al teach a cleaning process and composition (see abstract). An example of such a process contacts at least a portion of an article with a composition comprising decamethylcyclopentasiloxane solvent, water, and additional siloxane solvent and removing the solvent by blotting or centrifugation (col. 7, example 63 and col. 10, claims 1-10). Note that the articles to be cleaned may be contacted with the composition by spraying, brushing, or rubbing (col. 5, lines 11-17). As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

Art Unit: 1751

Applicants have traversed this rejection on the grounds that Kilgour et al teach spot treatment process and an immersivc cleaning method, not a non-immersivc cleaning process which limits the amount of solvent contacting the fabric. The examiner maintains that a non-immersivc process is not claimed, and as the fabric may be treated with solvent up to the absorption capacity of the fabric, such a completely saturated fabric would be indistinguishable from a fabric immersed in solvent. Accordingly, an immersed fabric meets a saturated fabric limitation and so the rejection is maintained.

5. Claims 1-6, 9, 11-27 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Madore et al, US 5,057,240.

Madore et al teach a liquid detergent having fabric softening properties (see abstract). An example of such a composition comprises a quaternary ammonium softener, octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane solvent, and water (col. 8, example IV). These liquid laundry detergents are used in a standard machine washing process (col. 7, example III). As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

Applicants have traversed this rejection on the grounds that Madore et al teach an immersivc cleaning method, and not a non-immersivc cleaning process which limits the amount of solvent contacting the fabric. The examiner maintains that a non-immersivc process is not claimed, and as the fabric may be treated with solvent up to the absorption capacity of the fabric, such a completely saturated fabric would be indistinguishable from a fabric immersed in solvent.

Art Unit: 1751

Accordingly, an immersed fabric meets a saturated fabric limitation and so the rejection is maintained.

6. Claims 1-6, 9-24 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murphy, US 6,313,079.

Murphy teaches a heterocyclic dry cleaning surfactant and method for using (see abstract). The dry cleaning compositions contain carbon dioxide gas, water and cyclic siloxane (col. 7, claims 1, 3, and 8). An example of such a composition comprises a quaternary ammonium softener, octamethylcyclopentasiloxane solvent, and water (col. 8, example IV). These dry cleaning compositions are used in standard dry cleaning machines which include distillation tanks, filters and solvent exits (col. 4, lines 56-67). As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

Applicants have traversed this rejection on the grounds that Murphy teaches an immersive cleaning method, and not a non-immersive cleaning process which limits the amount of solvent contacting the fabric. The examiner maintains that a non-immersive process is not claimed, and as the fabric may be treated with solvent up to the absorption capacity of the fabric, such a completely saturated fabric would be indistinguishable from a fabric immersed in solvent. Accordingly, an immersed fabric meets a saturated fabric limitation and so the rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 1751

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-6 and 9-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madore et al, US 5,057,240.

Madore et al are relied upon as set forth above. With respect to specific finishing agents and hand modifying agents, the examiner notes that such components are well known in the detergent arts for treating fabrics and do not lend patentable weight to the claims.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

Art Unit: 1751

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Boyer whose telephone number is (703) 308-2524. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If reasonable attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta, can be reached on (703) 308-4708. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310 for non-after-final amendments and (703) 872-9311 for after-final amendments.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Charles Boyer



July 14, 2003